

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5-7, 12, and 13 is sought to be amended. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-13 are pending in the application, with 1 being the sole independent claim. No new matter has been entered based on these amendments.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to FIG. 4 as showing element 414 as being labeled SAR, but being disclosed as an analog-to-digital converter. The original specification supported this element as being, for example, either a SAR or an ADC. In a Preliminary Amendment filed concurrently with the continuation application, paragraph [0029] was amended to read “a successive approximation register (SAR) architecture analog-to-digital converter.” This does not eliminate the fact it is a SAR as well, which is what is shown in FIG. 4. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 5-7, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite. Although Applicants disagree that these claims were indefinite, Applicants have amended these claims in order to expedite prosecution. The amendments are not intended to narrow the claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,942,935 to Okanobu (“Okanobu”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,331,944 to Lee (“Lee”). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being unpatentable over Okanobu in view of Lee, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,166,591 to Schultz et al. (“Schultz”) or U.S. Patent No. 5,604,501 to McPartland (“McPartland”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Although Applicants disagree with the Examiner, Applicants have amended the claims in order to expedite prosecution. None of the applied patents either alone or in obvious combination teach or suggest one or more features taught in amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections. Also, based at least on their dependency from claim 1, claims 2-13 should be found allowable over the applied patents.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding final Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Duncan *et al.*
Appl. No. 10/767,424

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Jan Eisenberg
Jason D. Eisenberg
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,447

Date: 10/27/04

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

324006_1.DOC